G. R. S. 59].

GPB—15,000—20-12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1903-04.
~~191~~ .
(Courts)

File No. 172 of 03-4

Serial Nos. 1 to 6.

Papers Filed. Communication

Month ~~August~~ 04.

SUBJECT.

Advance of Rs 260/- to be drawn from the treasury for payment to one Gonapathi Setty in ~~accn~~ OS no. 357 of 97-98.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

Courts 87 no. 109 of 02-03.

LATER REFERENCES.

Cts 319-14.

Issued B Seshadri Esq

Office of the Dewan of Mysore.

File No. (if any) 240 of 99-1907

Directions.

No., date and purport of receipts to be entered in red, and office note in black ink in order of dates.—To be written only on one side, and inside the line of margin.

Office Note.

Branch Judicial

Ms No 3.

Subject Advance of Rs 260 to be drawn from the Treasury for payment to one Ganapathy Chetty plaintiff in O.S. No 357 of 1897-9 as the said amount was misappropriated by the late Nazir Chandrasekharaiya.

Letter No. 3276/15-3 dated 30th November 1903 from the Registrar Chief Court requesting sanction to an — — — — — — — — — — — —

1. The Registrar States that a Sum of Rs 260 paid into the Bangalore Municipal Mensiff's Court by one Ganapathi Chetty plaintiff in O.S. No 357 of 1897-9 for payment to the 2nd Defendant in the suit was sent to the Treasury with Receipt order No 102 of 4th February 1898; that on this deposit two cheques were issued for payment to the parties in two other cases; that the Counterfoil of these cheques show that Rs 150 & Rs 97-12-2 were paid towards the above mentioned Receipt order No 102, the bal-

balance of Rs 12-3-10 have lapsed to Govt, and that the amount deposited for payment in the above two cases is stated to have been misappropriated by the late Nazir, Chandrasekharaiah.

2. The Registrar requests that the amount, viz Rs 269/- may be drawn as an advance from the Treasury for payment to the plaintiffs, Ganapathi Chetti who deposited the said sum of Rs 26 o/-, subject to adjustment after recovery from the officer responsible for the same. He further states that the cheques referred to above were signed by the retired munsiffs, Messrs Vanderlow and Sreenivasa Rao, and that their explanations will be called for and further report submitted to Govt. Solicited for orders with draft.

8/12/03

3 The Registrar's description of the dealing with the 3 deposit amounts referred to in his letter is rather confusing. What occurred was, apparently that the deposit of Ganapathi Chetti

which has lapsed to Govt.

having an item of (2 Rs 2 odd) was utilised in payment of two other claims, while the amounts duly deposited for meeting these claims were misappropriated. The total amount misappropriated was thus, it would seem Rs 329 odd; but only Rs 260 is required to be advanced, because that is the sum immediately wanted to meet Samapathi Chetty's pending claims.

4. This may be sanctioned as requested by the Chief Court. It would, at the same time, be more convenient if the Chief Court would send up one consolidated list of such anticipated dues (in addition to the supplementary 5 three already sent), instead of a number of supplemental references like this. It would also be less [illegible] annoyance to the officer who will eventually have to make good the amounts misappropriated.

11/12/3

8-12-03.

The Dewan through the 2nd Councillor

559
14-12-03
Shamaraja pattna.

5 Asi the 2 dept who seem entitled to claim the money except P H Gana- Nath settle the P H Asi right- please? The latter had to pay Rs 260 to the former & he paid it- The money was otherwise appropriated by the Court- The 2 dept has not yet been paid

Audit in for his claim
Payment not pass
Pl. to claim. a Refund

When again how could
Aug Rs 97-12-2 have
been paid by the Treasury
on a cheque for Rs
129-6-5? How
Treasury could two cheques
for amounts aggregating
Rs 329-6 have been
drawn when the deposit
available, tho' on another
account was only Rs 260
Some further explanation
seems necessary - If however
the Secretary is satisfied
that there is no doubt
the order proposed may be
passed - G.

15/12/03

This office should have
tacked on sufficient
paper for Council
recording Government
Order. It is
stated in the
draft sent by S.C.
that the Chief
Secretary

Vide Plaintiff's draft-memo the enquiry appended
Draft settled
24/12/53
Vide draft issued —

Memo No 5. 7. In reply, the Registrar, states, that though the amount was paid into Court by Plaintiff for payment to the 2nd Defendant, as the latter has been insisting on payment of the amount to him out of Court as per terms of the Rajeenamah filed in the case, the Plaintiff has now applied for refund of the amount to him & that this also accounts for the delay in preferring the claim, which is reported to be a bona fide one.

8 As regards the enquiry as to how only Rs 97-12-2 could have been paid by the Treasury on a cheque for Rs 179-6-8 and how the two cheques for amounts aggregating Rs 329-6-4 could have been drawn when the deposit available was only Rs 200/- the Registrar's statement that payment of cheque

No

No 25 dated 20th September 1898 was orde-
-ed to be made out of the deposit
order No 102 dated 4th February 189
(97-12-2) and No 84 dated 4th December
1897 (Rs-81-10-3), the two aggregating
Rs 179-6-5, that the Nazir drew the
full amount of the cheque, but
that in applying it in payment
to parties, he paid a sum of Rs 97-12-2
out of it, together with another
sum of Rs 150 drawn on cheque
No 143 dated 15th March 1898 to
the party to whom a sum of
Rs 247-12-2 had to be paid-

Submitted for orders with a draft

26/2/04.

I have asked the
- sent a clerk
explain - [illegible]
- in person.
26/2/04

2. I have gone over the correspondence
with the clerk sent by the Registrar;
but he is unable to explain the details
properly. There are a number of points
which require to be cleared up. Vide
draft-paragraphs-

27/2/04

Put up
10 June
29/2/04

Rev 1-3-04

11 The following letter was issued:—

Letter

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 24 of 1899-00.

Serial No.	
6	Letter No. 1789 dt the 4th March 1900. to the Registrar of the Chief Court; Enquiring if the deposit amounts of Rs 260 & 81.10.3 sent to Treasury with Receipts ords no. 102 & 82, were disposed of by Cheques no. 143 & 25 for Rs 150 and 175-6-8; the latter drawn partly on Rct no 102 & partly on Receipt ords no. 82, allowing a balance of Rs 12.3.10 to lapse; if the individuals to whom they were drawn were paid; if these were out of deposits from which these persons were properly payable. &c &c. if they are available for recoupment or if they have been misappropriated by the Nazir.
7	12 from the Registrar no. 211/20 dated the 11th April 1900. States that the Summary of the transactions as given above is correct: that the amount deposited for payment to Ganapathy Chetty was withheld by him the Nazir for payments. to the Narayanaswamy Chetty for Rs 150 and to one Kasim Sett & Others, for Rs 175-6.5, the Sums available for payment

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—10 000—19-5-04

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 24 of 1899-1900

Serial No.

to the latter person were misappropriated by the Nazir, except the small amount of Rs 12.3.10. & that the latter sum which had lapsed has since been drawn and is now available for payment to Ganapathy Chetty.

13 The sum that has now to be drawn for payment to Ganapathy Chetty is Rs 247.12.2 — Submitted for order

22/7/04 22-7-04

14 Please read the correspondence & pass an order in lieu of the draft already put up, with regard to the above in (para 24) and —

23 July

Submitted draft

25/7/04 25-7-04

15 Lay before the 1st Councillor &

25/7/1904

156 25-7-04

16. Under the circumstances, I agree to the order proposed — Draft adopted.

C.

17 Draft Submitted herewith 26/7/04.

535 28.7.04 Decision Sanction for approval

26.7.1904

MG/PBC-10-600-19-5-04

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 24 of 1899-1900.

Serial No.	
8.	8. Approved by the Dewan & following was issued Govt Proceedings No 281-2, dated 3-8-1904. Sanctions Rs 2(1)-11-2 being drawn as an advance from Treasury to be ~~refund~~ subject to recoupment, and directs submission of a consolidated list of amounts likely to be similarly required for payment to parties, on account of the defalcations of Chandrasekharaiah.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—10 000—19-5-04

Not exceed
Rs 1000 including

10

Read :—

Letter No. 3276/153 dated 30th November 1903 from the Registrar, Chief Court, requesting Sanction to a sum of Rs 260 being drawn from the Treasury as an advance and paid to the plaintiff, Ganapathi Chetty in O.S. No 357 of 1897-98 on the file of the Principal Munsiff's Court, Bangalore, and stating that the amount referred to, which was paid by Ganapathi Chetty for payment to the 2nd defendant in the suit, was sent to the Treasury for deposit with receipt order No 102 of 4th February 1898, that out of this deposit Rs 150 & Rs 97-12-2 were paid to ~~Ganapathi~~ one Rayappa Samiah in Execution Case No 361 of 1897-98 and Kasseem Saib

Suit & 2 others in O.S. No 315 / Mis. No 371 of 1896-97 respectively, the balance Rs 12-8-0 having lapsed to Govt, that the amount deposited for payment in the above two cases is stated to have been misappropriated by the late Nazir, Chandra-sekharaiah, and that the sum of Rs 260 referred to has to be paid to the plaintiff Ganapathy Chetty who has applied for payment of the same.

Order thereon:—

As recommended by the Chief Court, the Govt of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to accord sanction to the sum of Rs 260/- being drawn from the Treasury as an advance and paid to the Claimant concerned,

2. This amount should be adjusted by recovery from the

№ 3276
153

1862 Sl no 3
03-04

1

Bangalore.
Secret Court
30th November 1903.
FILE No. 172 of 03-4
SERIAL No. 1.

From V. A. Rajaratna Mudaliar Esquire,
Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore.

To

H. V. Nanjundayya Esquire, M.A. M.L.
Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Genl: and Revenue Depttº

Sir,

Adverting to the correspondence ending with Government proceedings No. X 147-48 dated 16th July last in re defalcation in the Bangalore Principal Munsiffs' Court, I have the honor to state that the District Judge of Bangalore reports that a sum of Rs 260 paid by one Ganapathi Chetty, plaintiff in O.S. № 357 of 1897-98 on the file of the Principal Munsiffs' Court, Bangalore, for payment to the 2d defdt in the suit was sent to the Treasury for deposit with Receipt Order № 102 of 4th February 1898. Towards this deposit,

X
Courts 109 of 02-03

the

The Bailiff says, two cheques No. 143 dated 19th March 1898 and No 25 dated 20th September 1898, have been issued for Rs 150 and Rs 179-6-5 respectively, the former sum payable to one Narayanaswamia in Execution Case No 361 of 1897-98 and the latter to plaintiffs, — Kadiria Pait and 2 others in O.S. No 315 / Misc No 371 of 1896-97. The entries in the Counterfoils of these cheques show that Rs 150 and Rs 97-12-2 (a portion of Rs 179-6-5 drawn by Cheque No 25 of 20th September 1898) were paid towards Receipt Order No 102 dated 4th February 1898, the balance Rs 12-3-10, having lapsed to Government. The amounts deposited for payment in the above two cases is stated to have been misappropriated by the late Nazir, Chendrasekaraiah.

150-0-0
179-6-5
329-6-0

Viz. Rs 150 + 179-6-0 = 329-6-0 Was no mistake in this misapprehension? If so, why only Rs 260 is claimed for?

The plaintiff Ganapathi Chetty, who deposited Rs 260, has now applied for

(4)

Sl No 4

Office Draft. (Docket.)

4

Mysore Government,
Secretariat, General & Revenue Branch.

SECTION: ~~The~~ Courts.

FILE No. 172 of 03-04

Sl. No. 2

To ~~The~~ Registrar
Chief Court

Date of passing the draft 22/12/03
Date of despatch

Regd. No. 1281
File No. & date (if any) J.249 99-00.

No. of Encls:

The Registrar's letter
No 3276 dated 30
1553
November 1903 ~~from~~
~~the Registrar, Chief~~
~~Court~~ requesting
sanction to ~~the~~ a
sum of Rs 260 being
drawn from the Treasury
as an advance and
paid to the Plaintiff
~~Opp~~ Ganapathi Chetty
in O.S. No 357 of 1897-98
on the file of the Principal
Munsiffs' Court Banga-
lore, the amount
in question having
been misappropriated
by the late Nazir
Chandrasekhariah.

With reference to the

above, has the
honour to observe
as follows:—

It is the 2nd Defendant
who seems entitled to
claim the money and
not ~~Plaintiff~~ Guna-
-pathi Chetty, the
Plaintiff. The
latter had to pay
Rs260 to the former,
and he paid it. The
money was otherwise
appropriated by the
Court. The 2nd Defendant
has not yet been
paid, and it is for him (it ~~for him~~)
to claim payment &
not for Plaintiff to
claim a refund. Then
again it is not clear
how only Rs97-12-2
could have been paid
by the Treasury on a
cheque for Rs179-6-5
and how moreover,
the two cheques for
amounts aggregating
Rs329 6-0 could have
been drawn when the
deposit available, though
on another account
was only Rs260.

The Respondent

is requested to furnish further explanation on the above points at an early date.

By order

21/12/43

for Secretary

№ 5229/233

J 1296. dl No. 5

SEC. Courts. Bangalore, 19th February 1904

FILE NO. 1720/02/04

From,

W. A. Rajaratna mood. Esqr.

Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore

To. L. Anantasawmy Row Esqr.

Offg: Secretary to Government.

Genl: & Rev. Departments

Sir.

With reference to your docket no. 1281 J 240/99-00 dated 22nd December 1903 in re the claim of Gyanapatty Shetty to a sum of Rs 260/- in O.S. no. 357 of 1897-98 on the file of the Principal Munsiff of Bangalore, I am directed to state that though the amount was paid into Court by Plaintiff for payment to the 2nd Defendant, as the latter has been insisting on payment of the amount to him out of Court as per terms of the Rajeenamah filed in the case, the Plaintiff has now applied for refund of the amount to him. This also accounts for the delay in transferring the claim and it is reported that there appears to be no reason to doubt the

Contd. inside

bonâfides of the claim.

As to the question how only Rs 97-12-2 could have been paid by the treasury on a cheque for Rs 179-6-5, and how the two cheques for amounts aggregating Rs 329-6-- could have been drawn when the deposit available was only Rs 260/-, I am to state that payment of cheque no. 25 dated 20th September 1898 was requested to be made out of the deposit order no. 102 dated 4th February 1898 (Rs 97-12-2), and no. 84 dated 4th December 1897 (Rs 81-10-3) the two aggregating Rs 179-6-5, that the nazir drew the full amount of the cheque note that, when applying it in payment to parties, he paid a sum of Rs 97-12-2 out of it together with another sum of Rs 150/- drawn on cheque no. 143 dated 19th march 1898 to the party to whom a sum of Rs 247-12-2 had to be paid.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant;

Registrar

Min

(6) Sl. no. 6

No. 1785 84/3/04
J7249/99-00

To Treasurer
The Registr, Chief Court
1720/03 04

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. 5229/1551 of the 19th Febry 1904 regarding the advance of Rs 260 proposed to be drawn from the Treasury for payment to one Jamadar Chetty, I am directed to state that the particulars given in para 2 of the above letter do not quite tally with those given in your earlier letter of 30th Novr 1903 no. 3276/156, & that there are still some points which require to be cleared up.

2. It is understood that the amounts deposited in the Treasury referred to in the correspondence, were : —

I. Rs 260 .... Sent to Treasury with Receipt order no. 102 of the 4th Febry 1898

II. Rs 81-10-3 .... with slip no. 84 of the 4 Dec 1899

or a total of Rs 341-10-3.

These amounts were apparently disposed of as follows

Seen
sl
5/3/04

Typed.
2/3/04

i) Rs 150 .... drawn on Receipt order no. 102 by means of cheque no 143, d/19-3-98

ii) Rs 179-6-5 ... drawn partly on the balance of Receipt order no. 102 and partly on Receipt order no 84 by means of cheque no 25, d/20-9-98

iii) Rs 12-3-10 .... balance of Receipt order no 102, allowed to lapse

341-10-3

3. I am to enquire firstly, if the above is a correct summary of the transactions in question;

secondly, the names of the individuals to whom the items i) & ii) drawn on cheques nos 143 & 25 were respectively paid;

thirdly, whether there are not other deposits from which these individuals were properly payable;

fourthly, if there are such deposits, what has become of the same, and whether they are available for recoupment of the plaintiff Municipality shall for the last seven deposits which were otherwise utilised, or, on the contrary, have been wholly misappropriated by the Nazir, & what the amounts are of these deposits.

4. It is requested that the above queries may be furnished with any further information that may throw a clear light on the whole matter & have

29/2/04

Dy Commr

Dy Commr

[N.B. The accounts given in the two letters on this point differ. &c]

[1st the amounts, in case of any Rs 247-12-2, and the Rs 349-6-5, were paid to a single individual, what became of the balance.]

Nº 211/20 Sec: 3

Sl. No. 7 J116/04-05

Bangalore, 11th July 1904.

FILE NO. 1720/03-04

From

SIR,

V. A. Raja Ratna Mudr Esqr. I.C.S.
Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore

To

B. V. Venkatavarada Iyengar Esqr.
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Genl: & Rev: Depts.

Sir,

Adverting to the correspondence ending with your letter Nº 1784/J.724 of 99-00 dated 24th March 1904 regarding the advance of Rs. 260/- proposed to be drawn from the Treasury for payment to Ganapathy Chetty, I am directed to state that the summary of the transactions as given in the letter under reply is correct.

2. As to questions 2 to 5, I am to state that one Narayanaswamy Chetty, Plaintiff in O.S. Nº 1301 of 1896-9 was entitled to a sum of Rs. 150/- out

out of the money deposited in Court on his account but which was misappropriated by the late Nazir by false entries in Books to the effect that the amount had been lodged in the Treasury with Receipt order nº 108. Having been informed that there was no amount available in the Treasury to meet the demand of the party in the case, he met it out of the deposit amount lodged in Receipt Order nº 102 for Rs. 260/- due to Ganapathey Chetty.

3. Rupees 179-6-5 shewn in item nº 11 of the letter under reference was paid to Kassim Sêt and others who had to be paid out of a deposit in O.S. nº 315 of 1896-97. As the amount deposited in this case had also been misappropriated by the Nazir, the demand from the parties was met from the deposits under two deposit orders nos 102 & 84, i.e. Rupees 97-12-2 from the

From V. A. Raja Rama Iyengar Esq.
Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore.

To S. R. Subbaraya Iyer Esq.
District Judge, Bangalore.

Dated 8th March 1904. 15

No 5658/366 Encl to 8-8"

With reference to his letter No 1020/257 dated 20th November 1903, has the honor to request that he will be so good as to furnish the following information regarding the sum of Rs. 247-12-2 said to have been embezzled by Chandrasekhariah, late Nazir of the Principal Munsiff's Court and which it is proposed to be drawn as an advance from the treasury for payment to one Ganapathy Chetty, Plaintiff in O.S. No 357 of 1897-98 on the file of the Principal Munsiff of Bangalore.

It is clear from the report of the Principal Munsiff forwarded with the above that payments of cheques Nos 143 & 25 for Rs. 150/- and Rs. 179-6-5 have

have been met from the deposits made under Receipt orders nos 102 & 84 as shewn below.

Deposit order no 102 on account of Gana-
pathey Chetty Rs. 260 — " — "
— " — no 84 — " — of a person
not known — Rs. 81 — 10 — 3

Total amt. of the 2 deposit orders — Rs. 341 — 10 — 3

Cheque no 143 issued to Rs. A. P.
Narayanasamiah — — — 150 — " — "
— " — no 25 issued to
Kasim Sit & others — — — 179 — 6 — 5
Amount allowed to be lapsed 12 — 3 — 10

Total amount of cheques issued — Rs. 341 — 10 — 3

Thus it will be seen that the entire amn of Rs. 341-10-3 deposited by Ganapathey Chetty and another individual whose name is not given, had been utilized for payment of Cheques issued to parties who were not entitled to be paid out of the deposits in nos 102 & 84, though they may be entitled for payment under the deposit

Orders

From S. A. Subbarayya Iyer Esq.
District Judge, Bangalore. 17

To V. A. Raja Ratna Mudr. Esq.
Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore.

Dated 26th May 1904. Rec'd 28-5-
No 2242/574.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No 5658/366 dated the 8th march 1904 intimating the sum of Rs. 247-12-2, reported to have been misappropriated by Chandrasekariah, late nazir of the Principal Munsiff's Court, Bangalore, I have the honor to submit herewith copy of letter No 1114/167 dated the 21st ultimo from the Munsiff, furnishing the information called for.

I have, etc.

Sd/- S. A. Subbarayya
Distt: Judge.

Copy,
Sd/- Rajaratnam
Registrar.

Nitu

Principal Munsiff's Court,
Bangalore, dated 19th April 1904
Despd. 21st April 1904

No. 1114/167

From
M. J. Gopalaiyer Esqr.
Principal Munsiff, Bangalore

To S. A. Subbaraya Iyer Esqr.
District Judge, Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to your No. 1898/850 dated 10th March 1904, calling for certain information required by the Registrar of the Chief Court in his letter No. 5658/366 dated 9.3.04 addressed to you, I have the honor to submit the following report.

Answer to Question No. 1.

(a) Cheque No. 143 dated 19.3.1898.

P. Narayanaswamy Chetty, Plaintiff in O.S. No. 1301 of 96-7 and petitioner in Execution No. 361/97-98 was entitled to be paid Rs. 150/- out of deposit No. 108, dated 8.3.98. from the Cash

Registr

Register dated 3-3-1898 it appears that Rs. 150/- were received in Court by the late nazir Chandrasekariah, the amount having been sent from the Hungund treasury the Debit entries on the 8th march 1898, show that the said amount was intended to be remitted to the District treasury. Execution no 361 of 1897-98 is one of the numbers quoted in the counterfoil of R.C. no 108. As already reported, no money was sent to the treasury with this R.C. sent to the treasury with this R.C. no 108. But it appears to have been pocketed by the late nazir. Knowing therefore, that there was no deposit in the treasury at the credit of Rama Yanaveeramma Chetty (Plaintiff in O.S. no 1301 of 96-97), the said official issued a cheque to him for Rs. 150/- payable out of deposit no 102.

(b) Cheque no 25

As already reported, Rs. 179-6-5 were paid to the nazir in Court on the 26-7-98, towards O.S. no 315 of 96-7

&c

He has given credit for it in the credit columns of the Cash Register. On the same day he perhaps intended to remit the amount to the treasury and debited the said amount in debit columns. The words "O & [illegible] 05" appear in the 17th column with out any number of the R.O. no receipt order appears to have been actually issued. The amount must have been misappropriated by nazir Chandrasekhariah. Thus there was no deposit in the treasury However when the party entitled to payment in O.S. 315/37 of 96-97 applied for payment, the nazir, knowing that he did not send any money to the treasury towards the said suits, issued cheque no. 25, dated 20th September 1898, payable out of other deposit numbers 102 (4.2.98) and 284 (4.12.97)

[illegible]

23

It is therefore evident that though moneys were paid into Court by the parties bound to pay both in O.S. No 1301 of 96-97 and in O.S. No 315 of 96-97, no money was deposited in the Treasury in the said suits for payment to the parties entitled to receive the same; consequently there is nothing available for payment to Ganapathy Sethy or other persons. The second Question is thus answered.

Answer to the 3rd Question —

The R.O. No 84 for rupees 300/- was sent on 17-11-97 / 4-12-97 to the Treasury and was made payable to several plaintiffs. In the deposit Register the amount is described as "[illegible]" This amount is debited in the Cash Register on the 30th November 97.

N

It is therefore not possible to say to whom in particular deposit no 84 of 4th Dec. 97 was payable.

I have, etc.

S/d. N. D. Gopalaiyar,
Pub. Mff.

Copy,
D. Raj Mahendra
Registrar.

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

is requested to furnish detailed information on this point.

3. The information called for in paras 2 of Govt. Proc. nos. 1475-80 and 147-48 dated the 15th March 1903 and 16th July 1903 respectively should also be expedite

4. Government will be glad if instead of individual reference like the present one consolidated and final bill could be given of all the sums required to be advanced in consequence of misappropriation by the late Nazir of the Principal Munsiff's Court, Bangalore

29.VII.04

25/7/1904

Dy Secretary.

1.8.1904

To

The Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore
The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore.

25/7/04 25-7-04

Copd: V.R.K. 2-8-04.
Issued: KM 2-8-04